

Appendix E:
Citizen Emails

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 5:57 PM
To: APFO
Subject: APFO comments

We appreciate your consideration of the following points in regards to APFO.

The justification for not including additional publicly provided facilities in APFO because they are referenced elsewhere in the County code is flawed because roads, schools, and sewer and water service are also already referenced elsewhere in the County code.

The CIP includes all significant County expenditures related to current and future development and should be the guide for all those factors included in APFO.

- APFO testing should be expanded and reordered into the five "strategic priorities" used in the FY 2016 CIP; education (including the school system, the community college and libraries), essential infrastructure (including roads and facilities), public safety (including the detention center and police and fire stations), environmental (including storm water, water and sewer), and quality of life projects (including recreation and park facilities).

Current APFO data collection and projections should be reviewed to verify historical accuracy, improve collection frequency, and GIS display and analysis capability. Data support for any new factors added to APFO should be sourced from the agency responsible for the activities. All APFO data inputs should be standardized so that all agencies can access those inputs and the resulting analysis.

Any actions of the Director of Planning and Zoning such as approval of mitigation measures, tentative assignment of housing unit allocations, determination of road facility completion should be reviewed by an existing multi agency panel or the County Executive.

Reduce the 3 year average development review cycle to improve the timeliness of APFO testing that would result from the reduced "wait time" and need for mitigation before facilities needed to accommodate new development are available. Simplify the zoning categories, improve the clarity and reduce the complexity of the development permitting process.

Strong consideration should be given to developing impact fees for the existing APFO categories as well as new ones added that would then fund CIP projects in the CIP map area where the development is located to assure that the needed improvements are made in the proper geographic areas.

Respectfully submitted,

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2016 10:50 PM
To: APFO
Subject: Fwd: School overcrowding in 21042

An update to my email below:

The class sizes at Waverly (our school) are enormous. Two math classes have 30 and 32 kids in 3rd grade. First grade has a math class with 29 students. Fourth grade has a GT math class with 32 students.

Third grade has 109 students with only 4 teachers. Second grade has 115 students with 5 teachers.

All of this is totally unacceptable.

Hello -

I am writing to express that there are inadequate school facilities in 21042/21163.

My children attend Waverly Elementary School (currently over capacity). Within a 3-4 mile radius of my house, we have the following elementary schools:

- Waverly (over capacity)
- St. John's (over capacity)
- Hollifield Station (at capacity)
- Manor Woods (at capacity)
- West Friendship (under capacity but lacking in other adequate public facilities)

In this stretch of a couple of miles, we have the Turf Valley neighborhood which is under massive development. This development includes single family dwellings, townhouses, and multi-family housing. That development ALONE necessitates the construction of an additional elementary school in our area.

Our elementary school (Waverly) is scheduled to receive students from Manor Woods because Manor Woods cannot accommodate additional students. The school cannot accommodate additional students currently because it is serviced by a septic system instead of public water. This is absolutely mind-boggling to me, as the school was built in 1994 and I find it difficult to believe that nobody foresaw the need for growth at the school. Additionally, this particular school is situated on an enormous parcel of land that could easily accommodate

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2016 8:52 PM
To: APFO
Subject: School overcrowding in 21042

Hello -

I am writing to express that there are inadequate school facilities in 21042/21163.

My children attend Waverly Elementary School (currently over capacity). Within a 3-4 mile radius of my house, we have the following elementary schools:

- Waverly (over capacity)
- St. John's (over capacity)
- Hollifield Station (at capacity)
- Manor Woods (at capacity)
- West Friendship (under capacity but lacking in other adequate public facilities)

In this stretch of a couple of miles, we have the Turf Valley neighborhood which is under massive development. This development includes single family dwellings, townhouses, and multi-family housing. That development ALONE necessitates the construction of an additional elementary school in our area.

Our elementary school (Waverly) is scheduled to receive students from Manor Woods because Manor Woods cannot accommodate additional students. The school cannot accommodate additional students currently because it is serviced by a septic system instead of public water. This is absolutely mind-boggling to me, as the school was built in 1994 and I find it difficult to believe that nobody foresaw the need for growth at the school. Additionally, this particular school is situated on an enormous parcel of land that could easily accommodate additional construction.

In contrast, our school (Waverly) is so constrained on its parcel of land. Any additional construction on its property takes away from something, such as parking, ingress/egress, school playing fields, etc. School buses can barely safely enter school property. There is barely any place to have recess.


St. John's Elementary is also over capacity and very constrained on its property. Additional houses are being built currently in its district. This school has already redistricted students out to Waverly once and still remains over capacity.

All along Route 99, and down Bethany Lane, there are large parcels of land that have recently been sold which is going to be developed. Where will those students go? The current U.S. Post Office, servicing Woodstock, also on Route 99, is being developed into town homes. Where will those children attend school?

Another very large neighborhood is being developed by Ryan Homes right next to Hollifield Station Elementary.

This leaves West Friendship Elementary as the only elementary school in our general radius that is under capacity. As everyone is well aware, West Friendship is over 100 years old and is also serviced by a septic system. For many, many years there has been debate over whether to close the school or upgrade the facilities. Nothing has been done, but no students get shifted there due to inadequate facilities and paralysis over what to do with the school.

While Waverly Elementary is scheduled to undergo construction sometime in the next year, this construction will essentially keep the school at status quo regarding enrollment and capacity, once the Manor Woods students are transferred to Waverly.


Something MUST BE DONE to address the massive influx of students to this part of Howard County. Every tiny little scrap of land is being developed and THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH SCHOOLS to accommodate this influx.

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 9:50 AM
To: APFO
Cc: Weinstein, Jon
Subject: Schools test

I just watched your 13th meeting where a motion to increase acceptable school capacity to 120% was thankfully voted down.

My oldest daughter started kindergarten at Veterans Elementary the first year it opened, where it was immediately over capacity. I know that HCPSS planning had as much or more to do with this as APFO provisions, however, after redistricting to correct the problem, my younger two daughters are still at VES where capacity continues to be an issue thanks to more development. VES's capacity is 788, current student numbers are about 930. That may not seem like much of a difference to you, just a blip in population fluctuations, but I have been at Veterans for 9 years, nearly a decade, and experience tells me that the number will only go up, especially if more construction in our area is green-lighted.

But my school is not an anomaly. Ducketts Lane Elementary was built because of the construction explosion in ElkrIDGE. This is the third year that school is open and the population has increased so much that the pre-K/RECC program at Ducketts had to be removed to make room for regular classrooms, taking a step backwards in the goal to increase accessibility to preschool.

No matter what your feelings are about universal preschool, I can tell you first-hand what over-crowding looks like and it isn't easy or fun. It creates things like "sprinkles" where there are too many classes in a grade for each class to participate fully in PE or music or art at one time, so at least one class has to be broken up and spread among other classes - so while a third of the class is at PE, the other two thirds are in two different related arts classes. Cafeterias are crowded, so the lunch line moves more slowly and kids have less time to finish their lunch. Rooms meant for music classes have to be used as homerooms, so music teachers are in portables or they have to share the mini-auditorium (meaning two teachers each conducting a class in the same room at the same time). In some cases, closets meant for storage become classrooms. It means that the parking lot is dangerously over full at any event, which ends up discouraging families from participating in the events that create a community - whether it be school picnics or the science fair.

I believe it was Cole Schnorf who said that HCPSS can build as many schools as they want to fix the capacity problems. That is so unbelievably simplistic and ridiculous. Of course more schools can be built, but they won't magically appear. It takes time, money, and space. Perhaps in your deliberations you should consider adding a provision that forces developers to participate in providing adequate schools for the homes they want to build.

Someone else on the task force pointed out that you were convened to fix what was broken, so fix it for the greater good of the community, not the greater good of developers wallets.

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 7:38 AM
To: APFO
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Howard County Facilities - Tennis Facilities

Ms Mikulis and member of the Adequate Public Facilities Task Force

First, my apologies that I am so late in providing you any input to your discussions but I hope you will give this topic some consideration and perhaps even an entry in your list of recommendations to the County Executive.

My topic addresses the desperate need for additional Tennis Facilities, especially indoor facilities, in Howard County. Right now the county has two indoor facilities run by Columbia Association plus a couple of privately operated facilities at 40 West and Circle D. (I understand that Circle D has some relationship with the county for its existence and support). I would note that one of the CA facilities, the Owen Brown Bubble, is already beyond its expected useful life and is in serious need of replacement.

With these few facilities, Howard County supports almost as many tennis players as Montgomery County, a much larger county. During the winter months when indoor courts are at a premium, the courts are booked all day and evening almost every day of the week for league play and reserved block times. These block times are the only way to get regular and consistent playing time but these block times are held by the same people for years (kind of like Redskin season tickets) and it can be very difficult for new people to break in and find court time. At this time, CA is discussing the possibility of building another indoor facility but it would be considered a replacement for the Owen Brown Tennis Bubble, not an additional resource.

I would also note that these facilities also see high utilization during the spring and early summer when rain or other severe weather conditions force our league matches off of the outdoor courts to the indoors. It is always a real scramble to complete our league matches with so few facilities available when these conditions impact our play.

Other communities in the area, particularly Montgomery and Prince Georges county have a number of county operated indoor facilities to support their communities. I believe it is time that Howard County step up and established one or more such facilities for its own.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

[REDACTED]

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 12:52 PM
To: APFO
Subject: APFO

I want my voice to be heard!

I believe that over-building without proper infrastructure in Howard County is running rampant. How can such a healthy, well-educated county operate like this? There is tremendous over crowding in schools and a constant lack of sidewalks and classrooms to support the growth. Why are developers running this county?

Howard County needs to build responsibly.

I support the APFO Task Force.

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 9:15 AM
To: APFO
Cc: Stu Kohn
Subject: APFO Recommendations

To who it may concern,

I would like to see the current APFO regulations expanded beyond just the school and nearest road intersection capacities. There are many other 'essential' considerations such as medical/emergency room capacities, police and fire department capabilities, utility/sewage treatment facilities, ... Also there are many other 'quality of life' considerations that should be added such as adequate per capita park space, recreational and cultural facilities, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, ... All new development should be required to provide sidewalks.

Thank you for your consideration,

|

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 01, 2015 7:26 PM
To: APFO
Subject: APFO Concerns
Attachments: APFO concerns and questions for the task force.docx

Hello

Please review the attached input provided to HCCA Board Members for their review. I was recommended to send the my comments and concerns about the APFO process this address. Let me know if there are questions you may have about this my thoughts on APFO

Thank you

APFO

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 9:17 AM
To: APFO
Subject: APFO Relief Expiration

1. Currently the APFO gives relief to someone who wants to build if the public facility is still overburdened after 4 years. I can understand the motivation; it is hard to wait so long to undertake a project. But the county's greater responsibility is to the public, and the rest of us should not have to live with the consequences of allowing new construction when public facilities are not adequate. That relief after

4 years should be eliminated in the public interest.

At the same time, once a project is approved, it seems to take the county an unreasonable amount of time to process all the permits, review plans, etc. In the interest of good citizen service, steps should be taken to reduce this processing time so that projects that have been approved can move forward expeditiously.

2. Currently small new projects or conditional uses that increase density (such as two-family dwellings) are exempt from APFO. In areas of high infill like my own neighborhood of Dunloggin these small projects add up, e.g., our 900-family community is now over 1000 due to infill.

ALL new building or conditional uses that increase density should be made subject to APFO.